REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified Application is respectfully requested. Claims 5-8, 13-16, 18-21, 24-27, 32-34 and 43 are in the case. Claims 1-4, 9-12, 17, 22, 23, 28-31 and 35-42 have been canceled. The Specification has been amended.

Regarding the Examiner's Note (Page 2 of the above-identified Office Action), Claims 36, 38 and 41 have all been canceled, thereby rendering this note moot.

Regarding the objection to the Specification, the alleged informalities have been corrected in accordance with the Examiner's kind suggestions with respect thereto. It is therefore respectfully submitted that this objection has been overcome, and that the Specification is in proper form. Wherefore reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

Regarding the objection to the Claim 30, this claim has been canceled, thereby rendering this objection moot. Wherefore reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 9, 12, 13, 16-29, 32 and 35-43 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Dalmia *et al.*, this rejection is respectfully traversed with respect to Claims 5, 8, 13, 16, 18-21, 24-27, 32 and 43, with Claims 1, 4, 9, 12, 17, 22, 23, 28, 29 and 35-42 having been canceled, thereby rendering this rejection moot with respect thereto. Included in the grounds for the rejection of the claims subject to this rejection that remain in the case was the allegation that Dalmia *et al.* disclose an interpolator. Applicants respectfully dispute this allegation.

Initially, note that the exemplary interpolator set forth in the Specification, shown in Figures 3A and 3B, is a digital circuit that receives four phase signals, P_0, P_{90}, P_{180} and P_{270}, and under control of control signals SC0, SC1, TC0 and TC1 selects and combines the phase signals in a manner that allows insertion of the desired frequency and magnitude components of jitter onto the transmit clock. Thus, the recited interpolator not only eliminates the requirement for

analog circuitry for jitter generation, but also allows such jitter to be generated with digital precision that allows for jitter transfer measurement by a receiver that includes a counterpart interpolator (see, *e.g.*, Specification, paragraphs [0089]-[0099]). By contrast, Dalmia et al. disclose a prior art analog jitter generator wherein a sine wave modulates a VCO. They disclose no awareness of an interpolator nor the benefits of using an interpolator in jitter generation.

The other art of record is even less relevant.

Therefore, for the reasons set forth above it is respectfully submitted that Claim 5 is neither shown nor suggested by the patent to Dalmia *et al.*, nor, indeed, by any of the art of record whether considered individually or in any combination, and is therefore allowable. The other claims subject to this rejection that remain in the case also include the limitation of an interpolator, including independent Claims 13, 18, 19, 20, 24, 26, 32 and 43, and claims depending therefrom, and are therefore allowable as well for the same reasons, as well as for other limitations found therein. Wherefore reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 10, 11, 14, 15, 30, 31, 33 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Dalmia *et al.*, in view of Fan *et al.* this rejection is respectfully traversed with respect to Claims 6, 7, 14, 15, 33 and 34, with Claims 2, 3, 10, 11, 30 and 31 having been canceled, thereby rendering this rejection moot with respect thereto. Claims 6 and 7 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent Claim 5, Claims 14 and 15 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent Claim 13, and Claims 33 and 34 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent Claim 32. The reasons for the allowability of independent Claims 5, 13 and 32 over the patent to Dalmia *et al.* are set forth above. The patent to Fan *et al.* fails to cure the deficiencies of Dalmia *et al.*, having been cited for disclosing a PRBS generator.

The other art of record is even less relevant.

Therefore, for the reasons set forth above Claims 5, 13 and 32 are allowable over Dalmia *et al.*, Fan *et al.*, and, indeed, all of the art of record

whether considered individually or in any combination. Claims 6, 7, 14, 15, 33 and 34 all depend, either directly or indirectly from one of Claims 5, 13 and 32 and so are allowable as well for the same reasons, as well as for the additional limitations found therein. Wherefore reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

It is respectfully submitted that the claims recite the patentably distinguishing features of the invention and that, taken together with the above remarks, the present application is now in proper form for allowance. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, and allowance of the claims are requested at an early date.

While it is believed that the instant amendment places the application in condition for allowance, should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned in order to expeditiously resolve any outstanding issues.

To the extent necessary, the Applicants petition for an Extension of Time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136. Please charge any fees in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees to the Deposit Account No. 20-0668 of Texas Instruments Incorporated.

Respectfully submitted,

/J. Dennis Moore/

J. Dennis Moore
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 28,885

Texas Instruments Incorporated
P.O. Box 655474, MS 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
Phone: (972) 917-5646
Fax: (972) 917-4418